

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/532,794	04/25/2005	Masakazu Funahashi	28955.4026	6624	
27890 · 75	590 12/05/2006		EXAM	INER	
STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP			GARRETT, DAWN L		
1330 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20036			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1774	1774	
•			DATE MAIL ED. 12/05/2004	•	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
•	•	Application No.	
Office Action Summary		10/532,794	FUNAHASHI, MASAKAZU
•	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	- The MAILING DATE of this communication	Dawn Garrett	ith the correspondence address
- Period fo		i appears on the cover sneet wi	ur the correspondence address
WHIC - Extense after S - If NO - Failum Any re	DRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RICE HEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING sions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory pr a to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by seply received by the Office later than three months after the r d patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	G DATE OF THIS COMMUNION OF R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a r n. eriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON statute, cause the application to become AB	CATION. reply be timely filed ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status			•
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2	22 September 2006.	
		This action is non-final.	
•	Since this application is in condition for alle closed in accordance with the practice und	•	• •
Dispositio	on of Claims		
4)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-7</u> is/are pending in the applicati	ion.	•
•	la) Of the above claim(s) is/are with		•
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-7</u> is/are rejected.		
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8)	Claim(s) are subject to restriction a	nd/or election requirement.	
Application	on Papers		
9)[] 7	The specification is objected to by the Exar	miner.	
· ·	he drawing(s) filed on 25 April 2004 is/are		cted to by the Examiner.
	Applicant may not request that any objection to	the drawing(s) be held in abeyar	ice. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co	prrection is required if the drawing	(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)[] 7	The oath or declaration is objected to by th	e Examiner. Note the attached	d Office Action or form PTO-152.
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119		
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for ☑ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:	eign priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).
	1. Certified copies of the priority docum	nents have been received.	
	2. Certified copies of the priority docum		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the	•	received in this National Stage
. ~	application from the International Bu	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
* S	ee the attached detailed Office action for a	i list of the certified copies not	received.
Attachment	(s)		
	of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)
	of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948 ation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)		s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application
	No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	• •

Application/Control Number: 10/532,794 Page 2

Art Unit: 1774

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This Office action is responsive to the amendment filed September 22, 2006. Claim 1 was amended. Claims 1-7 are pending.

- 2. The rejections of claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Hosokawa et al. (EP 1061112 or JP 2001-131541) and under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Hosokawa et al. (US 6,951,693 or US 6,743,948) [JP 2001-131541, US 6,951,693 and US 6,743,948 are patent family equivalents of EP 1061112] are withdrawn due to the amendment requiring at least one specific "A" substituent group on the phenyl rings of formulas I and II.
- 3. The rejection of claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Shimada et al. (US 5,219,692) is withdrawn due to the deletion of formula III from claim 1.
- 4. The rejection of claims 1 and 2 on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-2 of U.S. Patent No. 6,743,948 is withdrawn due to applicant's response.
- 5. The rejection of claims 3-7 on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 2 of U.S. Patent No. 6,743,948 in view of US 6,951,693 is withdrawn due to applicant's response.

Application/Control Number: 10/532,794 Page 3

Art Unit: 1774

6. The rejection of claims 1-7 on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9 of copending Application No. 11/344,604 is withdrawn due to applicant's response.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 8. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Matsuura et al. (US 2005/0064233 A1). Applicant cannot rely upon the foreign priority papers to overcome this rejection because a translation of said papers has not been made of record in accordance with 37 CFR 1.55. See MPEP § 201.15.

The applied reference has a common inventor with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

Matsuura et al. discloses the following general compound (see par. 27):

Application/Control Number: 10/532,794

Art Unit: 1774

$$(A^{15})_{ij}$$
 $(A^{15})_{ij}$ $(A^{15})_{ij}$ $(A^{15})_{ij}$ $(A^{15})_{ij}$

where X is a condensed aromatic ring. The substituent groups include those required by applicant (see par. 29-38). More specifically, at least compounds EM111, EM112, EM113 and EM115-EM120 anticipate the compound required by applicant (see pages 23-24). Matsuura et al. discloses the compounds as part of the light emitting medium per claims 2 and 3 (see abstract). The compound shown above is considered to be component "A" as described by Matsuura et al. and the ratio of component A to component B in the light emitting medium is 1:99 to 99:1 per claim 4 (see par. 93 and claim 10). Matsuura et al. further includes a hole injecting layer per claims 5 and 6 between the light emitting layer and the anode that is made of conventional materials (see par. 132) and more specifically, Matsuura et al. discloses an aromatic tertiary amine as a layer between the anode and the light emitting layer (see par. 148). With regard to claim 7, the light emitting device emits bluish light (see abstract).

Double Patenting

9. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re*

Application/Control Number: 10/532,794

Art Unit: 1774

Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

10. Claims 1-6 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2, 8-12, 16 and 17 of US Pub. No. 2005/0064233 A1 Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because formulas I and II of the present claims are within the recitation of component A (the arylamine) in the claims of US Pub. '233.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dawn Garrett whose telephone number is (571) 272-1523. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rena Dye can be reached on (571) 272-3186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/532,794 Page 6

Art Unit: 1774

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Dawn Garrett
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1774